

# **EXHIBIT 15**

**In the Matter of:**

TENNESSEE CONFERENCE OF NATIONAL ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE

VS

WILLIAM LEE

TENNESSEE OF

*March 21, 2023*



**BERES & ASSOCIATES**  
COURT REPORTERS

[www.beresandassociates.com](http://www.beresandassociates.com)  
615.742.2550 | [info@beresandassociates.com](mailto:info@beresandassociates.com)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
NASHVILLE DIVISION

TENNESSEE CONFERENCE OF THE	)
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF THE	)
ADVANCEMENT OF COLORED PEOPLE,	)
On behalf of itself	)
and its members, et al.	)
	)
Plaintiffs,	)
	)
vs.	) CASE NO.
	) 3:20-cv-01039
	)
WILLIAM LEE, in his official	)
Capacity as Governor of the	)
State of Tennessee, et al.,	)
	)
Defendants.	)
	)

---

30b(6) VIDEOCONFERENCED DEPOSITION OF  
TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS  
REBECCA HARVEY

Taken on Behalf of the Plaintiffs

MARCH 21st, 2023 at 9:33 A.M. CST

Kasie B. Hardy, Court Reporter, RPR, CRR, CRC  
BERES & ASSOCIATES COURT REPORTERS  
Licensed Stenographic Court Reporters  
P.O. Box 190461  
Nashville, Tennessee 37219-0461  
(615) 742-2550  
kasie@beresandassociates.com

## A P P E A R A N C E S

(via videoconference)

For the Plaintiffs:

ALICE HULING  
VALENCIA RICHARDSON  
KATE UYEDA  
BLAIR BOWIE  
Attorneys at Law  
Campaign Legal Center.  
1101 14th St. NW  
Suite 400.  
Washington, DC 20005.  
(202)-736-2200.  
ahuling@campaignlegal.org  
vrichardson@campaignlegal.org  
kuyeda@campaignlegal.org  
bbowie@campaignlegal.org

For the Defendants:

ZACHARY BARKER  
MATTHEW JONES  
Attorneys at Law.  
Office of the Tennessee Attorney General  
Public Interest Division  
P.O. Box 20207  
Nashville, Tennessee 37202  
zachary.barker@ag.tn.gov  
matthew.jones@ag.tn.gov.

1 The 30(b)(6) videoconferenced deposition of  
2 TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, REBECCA HARVEY,  
3 was taken on behalf of the Plaintiffs on Tuesday,  
4 March 21st, 2023, at 9:33 a.m., for all purposes  
5 under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

6 The formalities as to notice, caption,  
7 certificate, et cetera, are expressly waived. All  
8 objections, except as to the form of the questions,  
9 are reserved to the hearing.

10 It is agreed that Kasie B. Hardy, being a  
11 Licensed Court Reporter and Notary Public for the  
12 State of Tennessee, may swear the witness, and that  
13 the reading and signing of the completed deposition  
14 by the witness was reserved.

15  
16  
17 \* \* \* \* \*

1 \* \* \*

2 MR. BARKER: The defense has three  
3 objections that we would like to make on the record  
4 at this time. First, defendants object to the  
5 30(b)(6) notices as overbroad and unduly burdensome  
6 to the extent that they require the deponent to  
7 review individual case files for individual  
8 circumstances contained in those case files.

9 Second, the defendant further objects  
10 to anything in the notices that require the deponent  
11 to go outside of their district, in this deposition  
12 being District 30, to obtain information about the  
13 topics contained in the notice.

14 And, finally, defendants object to the  
15 time frame of June 5th, 2006 to present as overbroad  
16 and not reasonably calculated to lead to discovery  
17 of relevant information for this case. But to the  
18 extent that the deponent knows, or his or her  
19 district has information available, that they have  
20 instructed to do the best that they can concerning  
21 the time frame provided.

22 MS. HULING: Okay. Plaintiff's counsel  
23 would like to note those objections and also note  
24 for the record that this deposition was noticed on  
25 February 28th. Those objections had not been raised

1 before today despite the fact that parties have had  
2 a meet-and-confer in that time and could have had  
3 multiple meet-and-confers to discuss those  
4 objections and come to agreement with regard to them  
5 before this deposition. So they're improperly  
6 raised now.

7 And further note that while similar  
8 objections were made in a deposition last Friday,  
9 the plaintiffs similarly noted the impropriety of  
10 those objections. No meet-and-confer was requested  
11 since then to discuss those objections in  
12 preparation for this deposition. But with that  
13 said, I am happy to move forward.

14 MR. BARKER: The defendants are ready  
15 to proceed.

16 MS. HULING: Thanks. All right, great.

17 REBECCA HARVEY,  
18 was called as a witness, and after having been first  
19 duly sworn, testified as follows:

20 E X A M I N A T I O N

21 BY MS. HULING:

22 Q Good morning, Ms. Harvey. My name is Alice  
23 Huling. I'm senior legal counsel with Campaign  
24 Legal Center. And here with me today are my  
25 colleagues, Kate Uyeda and Blair Bowie. And we are

1 all representing the plaintiffs in this case. Thank  
2 you so much for joining us today.

3 Would you please state your full name for  
4 the record.

5 A Rebecca Lynn Harvey.

6 Q Thank you, Ms. Harvey. And though we're not  
7 in a courtroom today, do you understand that you are  
8 under oath to tell the truth in all of your answers  
9 today?

10 A Yes, ma'am.

11 Q Terrific. Have you ever been deposed  
12 before?

13 A No, ma'am.

14 Q Okay, great. Well, hopefully this will be a  
15 comfortable and pleasant introduction to the  
16 process. But I do want to start by clarifying that  
17 this deposition is fundamentally an opportunity for  
18 me to ask questions and learn more about your office  
19 and its operations and the work that you do there.

20 And before we dive into all that, I'm going  
21 to go over a few ground rules for depositions  
22 generally just to make sure it goes as smoothly as  
23 possible today.

24 First and foremost, we have Ms. Hardy, our  
25 court reporter, who is transcribing everything that



1 Q Okay. Is there a period of time during  
2 which no conviction is disqualified?

3 A I can't recall.

4 Q And then just to round out some of the  
5 discussion we've been having on this part, we talked  
6 about when folks might have multiple convictions  
7 maybe related to their current term of supervision  
8 and maybe unrelated.

9 Are officers trained to sort of proactively  
10 ask about whether or not an individual has unrelated  
11 prior convictions as a part of their closing-out  
12 supervision process?

13 A Yes, ma'am.

14 Q So that's a standard question that should be  
15 asked when supervision is being wrapped up?

16 A Not asked, reviewed in the documentation.

17 Q Okay. But I think I understood you to say  
18 they wouldn't -- the officer wouldn't necessarily  
19 have access to documentation for prior convictions  
20 that are unrelated to their current term of  
21 supervision; is that right?

22 A Correct.

23 Q So if they don't have access to that, would  
24 the officer do anything to -- are officers trained  
25 to ask the individual if there is unrelated prior

1 mark that as Exhibit 14.

2 (Marked Exhibit No. 14.)

3 MR. BARKER: Defense again notes their  
4 objection to beyond the scope for this letter.

5 BY MS. HULING:

6 Q Ms. Harvey, do you see another restoration  
7 denial letter dated October 14, 2020?

8 A Yes, ma'am.

9 Q And this is in Hamilton County. Is that  
10 within District 30?

11 A Yes, ma'am.

12 Q And the reason for denial of restoration  
13 listed here is unpaid child support obligation.

14 Do you see that?

15 A Yes, ma'am.

16 Q Did you have any awareness that unpaid child  
17 support obligations could result in denial of one's  
18 restoration of voting rights?

19 A I did not.

20 Q So that's not something that's included in  
21 sort of training of the rights restoration process?

22 A We do not review child support obligations.

23 Q Okay. And it's not something folks in your  
24 office would have awareness of to tell someone when  
25 they're closing out their supervision, that in order